

REMARKS

The Official Action mailed December 17, 2003, has been received and its contents carefully noted. This response is filed within three months of the mailing date of the Official Action and therefore is believed to be timely without extension of time. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that this response is being timely filed.

The Applicants note with appreciation the consideration of the Information Disclosure Statements filed on March 6, 2002, and April 29, 2002. However, the Applicants have not received acknowledgment of the IDS filed on November 19, 2003. The Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner provide an initialed copy of the Form PTO-1449 evidencing consideration of this IDS. A further IDS is submitted herewith and consideration of this IDS is respectfully requested.

Paragraph 3 of the Official Action objects to the drawings and asserts that the drawings "fail to show the diagrams (figures 17A and 17b) as described in the specification" (page 2, Paper No. 20031209). The Applicants are unclear as to what the Examiner is objecting to, and respectfully request that the Examiner provide a more detailed clarification regarding the nature of the objection. It is noted that photographs of Figures 17A and 17B were resubmitted with the *Response to Notice to File Missing Parts* filed June 10, 2002. It is also noted that Figures 18A and 18B are schematic diagrams of Figures 17A and 17B. If the Examiner is not able to obtain a good quality version of Figures 17A and 17B or has any further questions on this matter, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

In response to the request in the Official Action at paragraph 4, the specification has been amended to correct minor typographical and grammatical errors. The Applicants will correct any additional errors in the specification of which the Applicants become aware.

Paragraph 5 of the Official Action objects to the title as not descriptive. In response, the title has been amended to METHOD OF MANUFACTURING A

SEMICONDUCTOR DEVICE HAVING A CRYSTALLIZED SEMICONDUCTOR FILM.
Reconsideration is requested.

Although the Official Action states that claims 1-26 are pending, the Applicants submit that claim 27 was added in the *Amendment and Response to Election Requirement* filed November 10, 2003. Therefore, claims 1-27 were pending in the present application prior to the above amendment. Claims 1, 6 and 27 have been amended to better recite the features of the present invention, and new claims 28-39 have been added to recite additional protection to which Applicants are entitled. Claims 11-26 have been withdrawn from consideration. Accordingly, claims 1-10 and 27-39 are currently elected, of which claims 1, 6, 27 and 31-33 are independent and claim 27 is generic. For the reasons set forth in detail below, all claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Paragraph 7 of the Official Action rejects claims 1-10 as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,506,636 to Yamazaki et al. The Applicants respectfully submit that an anticipation rejection cannot be maintained against the independent claims of the present invention, as amended.

As stated in MPEP § 2131, to establish an anticipation rejection, each and every element as set forth in the claim must be described either expressly or inherently in a single prior art reference. Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

Yamazaki does not teach all the elements of the amended independent claims, either explicitly or inherently. In claims 1, 6 and 27 of the present invention, plasma is used for increasing the density of crystal nuclei generated by the metal element (see page 3, lines 30-34, and page 4, lines 1-9). However, Yamazaki appears to teach the use of plasma for adding Ni to the film. In order to distinguish the present invention from Yamazaki, the Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 6 and 27 to recite providing the semiconductor film with a metal containing material after exposing the

semiconductor film to the plasma. Yamazaki does not teach at least the above referenced feature of the present invention, either explicitly or inherently.


Since Yamazaki does not teach all the elements of the independent claims, either explicitly or inherently, an anticipation rejection cannot be maintained. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 are in order and respectfully requested.

The Applicants note that claim 27 has not been formally rejected in the Official Action. For at least the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that claim 27 is allowable.

New claims 28-39 have been added to recite additional protection to which Applicants are entitled. For the reasons stated above and already of record, the Applicants respectfully submit that new claims 28-39 are in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Eric J. Robinson
Reg. No. 38,285

Robinson Intellectual Property Law Office, P.C.
PMB 955
21010 Southbank Street
Potomac Falls, Virginia 20165
(571) 434-6789